



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The general conference in Leon Mandel Hall was called to order Saturday, November 14, 1903, by President W. R. Harper, who announced that the topic for discussion was the general problem presented at the last general conference, viz., a proposition

1. To connect the work of the eighth grade of the elementary school with that of the secondary school.
2. To extend the work of the secondary school to include the first two years of college work.
3. To reduce the work of the seven years thus grouped together to six years.
4. To make it possible for the best class of students to do the work in five years.

At the last general conference this proposition was referred to a commission of twenty-one, which again was divided into three committees of seven each. These committees were to consider the matter of shortening the college course from a relative standpoint of the college, the secondary school, and the elementary school.

Superintendent F. L. Soldan, of St. Louis, reported for the Committee on Elementary Schools as follows:

The Committee on Elementary Schools has limited its consideration to the question of how such change would affect the elementary school. The change required of the latter would be from an eight-year course to one of seven years.

The committee, in trying to state its views, wishes to describe briefly the standpoint from which it has considered the question.

1. It holds it to be self-evident that the interests of the elementary school, considered by themselves, should be the first and chief consideration.
2. This standpoint implies that the interests of college education, while a most important matter, are considered second to the elementary-school interests, apart from all other considerations.
3. When viewed from the college standpoint, or from the standpoint of the educator who has a survey of the whole field, the interests of elementary school, high school, and college are a unit, and the adjustment of elementary education to the demands of the high school and college becomes a necessary and indispensable consideration. Each college student represents in him-

self the interests of the elementary school, the high school, and the college. On the other hand, the elementary pupil is not necessarily affected either now or in future by the interests of high school and college. There is apparently a divergence of interests.

4. From the standpoint of elementary education, or from that of the public good, such adjustment of the elementary school to the college or high school is not the chief consideration. The principal condition, from the standpoint of public education, is to make the common schools a source of thorough preparation for a good life and intelligent citizenship. The scholastic view, namely, that the elementary school has for its chief purpose the preparation of children for the high school, cannot be the view which broad public considerations sanction. The purpose of elementary education lies within itself, and is not determined by ulterior considerations.

5. It is therefore necessary to show that articulation with secondary schools or colleges is beneficial to the general interests of the elementary school. No adjustment to higher education can be approved if elementary education is thereby stinted or reduced.

6. There are evidently two main questions to be considered when the possibility of a shorter course for the elementary school is discussed: (*a*) Is such a change advisable, from the standpoint of the elementary school? (*b*) Is such adjustment feasible, from the standpoint of the teacher and from the standpoint of public opinion? In other words, is the reduction of the present course of eight years to seven of use or benefit to the elementary school itself? And if it should be found that it is practicable, the question again arises: In what way can it be carried out?

7. There are reasons, outside of those which result from the desire to adjust the curriculum to the college, which make the shortening of the course of the elementary school to seven years advisable.

a) Large numbers of children leave the elementary school and go to work before they have reached their eighth year of school. Very often children are withdrawn when twelve years old, partly because that seems the traditional age of leaving school, and partly because after that age their labor is of value in the market. If the possibility of finishing the elementary school in less time than the customary eight years is held out, it will work in a measure as an inducement to finish the whole course.

b) The necessary condensation of the work resultant from the adoption of a seven-year course will be beneficial. It will lead to a critical examination of the customary studies and their adjustment to the standpoint of common-sense and public utility. A certain redundancy of subject-matter may find correction by this readjustment of time, and educational and utilitarian essentials be better recognized. It may possibly be found that some of the matter embodied in the various studies is unessential, and more of scholastic than educational origin and value.

In a few cities the original course of eight years has been lengthened to

nine, by the addition of the kindergarten year to precede the primary grade. Seven years should be sufficient for the elementary course after the excellent preparation of kindergarten work, when without it eight years was sufficient time for the whole work.

c) The plan of an eight-year course of study in the elementary school has had a long trial. It is evident that there is, in the first place, less public demand for the higher grades than for the lower, judged by the evidence that the attendance decreases very much in the latter years of the common-school course. The rule is that only a small fraction of the children that enter the primary grade go through the eighth year of the course.

The scant attendance in the eighth grade leads practically in many cities to the transfer of the eighth-grade pupils to the few centrally located schools which can maintain such a grade. Some cities maintain for this reason "intermediate schools," in order to concentrate the work in the higher grades. Where pupils of the eighth grade can be combined in classes of convenient size, and taught by teachers who have in course of time specialized for this kind of work, better results are accomplished than are feasible where the classes are scattered and small, and to which, for this reason, the teacher cannot give her whole time, since she may possibly have an additional class of lower grade which she has to teach. This condition points to the advisability of the plan of limiting elementary-school work to seven years and combining the classes that have gone beyond this grade in the high school.

d) The independence of the elementary-school interests from the high-school and college interests, which was broadly stated above as the introductory part of the committee's discussion of this question, is a relative one. Granting that the great majority of the elementary students have nothing to do, either at present or in future, with the college or high school, it is just as patent a fact that the high school and the college have a great deal to do with them. The college has immense educational leverage, that has elevated every department of high-school instruction, and the high school has the same influence on the elementary school. This reactive influence of higher education on the lower schools makes college and high school a benefit to every elementary pupil, whether he ever becomes a student in those institutions or not. The seven-year course of the district school would help the high school and the college; but it would also be, for that very reason, an advantage to elementary education itself.

e) While it is not essential to this discussion to consider the demands made upon high school and elementary school by the schools above them, it is nevertheless so important a principle that it may be stated in this connection. The elementary school and the high school have educational interests to serve, which are attained through the acquisition of knowledge, the latter being the means, and the building up of manhood the aim. In the tests for admission to the higher schools the conditions should not be determined by scholastic considerations alone, but from the standpoint of educational training.

8. The question arises here whether the change to a seven-year course is feasible as well as advisable.

The most direct answer to this question is had by reference to the fact that there are cities which have been conducting their district schools on a seven-year basis with good results. Kansas City has this system in vogue, and her schools are progressive in spirit and excellent in results. The remarkably high percentage of the pupils which enter the high-school course from the seventh grade may perhaps not be altogether due to the shorter course, but the latter is certainly one of the causes, if not the sole reason which has brought about this result.

9. Public opinion holds the elementary schools dear above all other institutions. It feels their transcendent importance for the masses, and consequently for the life of the nation. It will not sanction any shortening of the course of study that cannot be shown to be in the interests of the elementary school itself. This aspect of the question has, for this reason, found a somewhat full discussion in the previous portion of this report.

10. The adoption of a seven-year course should involve no loss in educational essentials, although some scholastic features will necessarily have to be curtailed. Public opinion, in judging of the efficiency of public schools or the pupils thereof, has always laid somewhat greater stress on the practical skill and development of mind than on the scholastic attainments indispensable to school work. Its way of judging of the knowledge the child has obtained in school is to inquire what he can do. The ability to read fluently and with a degree of expression that suggests intelligence, the possession of a neat, legible handwriting, the power of correct expression in speech and writing, the ability to do sums quickly and accurately, are the features by which the success of education is popularly judged. There is some good reason for this attitude to be found in the fact that skill, after all, is knowledge converted into power.

These essentials represent a minimum which must not be reduced by any course of study. But, on the other hand, it may be mentioned as an illustration that there are topics in arithmetic and geography, for instance, that are of more importance from a scholastic standpoint than from educational considerations, and which may be omitted or reduced to the advantage of education. In regard to the very important study of history, the child is sufficiently mature in the sixth grade to begin the study, especially if it has been preceded by the supplementary reading of historical matter and oral lessons in the preceding grades. In the language studies chief stress should be laid on skill and intelligent use, with sufficient preparation in formal grammar; but much of the latter, especially its synthetical use, will be better understood by the learner when taught in the high school in connection with the study of some foreign language.

The shortening of the course should be effected, not by the transfer of the studies of the last year to the high school, but by the sifting of the present work of the elementary schools and its redistribution over seven years.

11. In some places the change from an eight-year course to a seven-year course may not be possible, and a different method of accomplishing the same result may be sought. In such cases consideration is deserved by the plan of not shortening the district-school course, but admitting at the end of the seventh year those pupils that intend to go to the high school, and offering, as heretofore, an eighth year to the others. The objection to this course is the reduction of the already small number of pupils remaining in the eighth grade. On the other hand, such a plan would offer a good opportunity for the desirable enrichment of the common-school curriculum. The studies of the eighth year, which would form the close of the school life for perhaps a majority of the pupils, should include algebra, the elements of constructive geometry, elements of general history, and popular science, perhaps physiology, and later physics. Neither of the latter studies require in their elementary features expensive apparatus and laboratory.

The committee begs leave to suggest that the secondary schools should make the transition from the elementary school less abrupt than it is at present, and that this necessary adjustment requires some important modifications in both the matter and the method of secondary education.

Approved by F. L. SOLDAN, St. Louis; J. W. COOK, DeKalb; W. S. JACKMAN, Chicago; EMILY RICE, Chicago.

Superintendent J. Stanley Brown, of Joliet, then reported for the committee from the point of view of the secondary school, as follows:

Your committee, appointed to consider the subject mentioned from the standpoint of the secondary school, reports in favor of the general proposition, and submits the following as covering the four points mentioned in such proposition:

In order that the school may fairly meet the conditions contained in the proposition, it must offer in *English* six units of work; by a "unit" we mean a subject pursued four or five periods of forty or fifty minutes each per week. Of these six units in English, one must be taken in each of the first two years of the course, one in either the third or fourth, and one in either the fifth or sixth year. So in English four units are prescribed, while two are elective.

In mathematics the school must offer five units of work, of which algebra to quadratics, one unit, and plane geometry, one unit, shall be taken during the first two years of the course, and one additional unit shall be taken either the third or fourth year of the course. So it will be seen that in mathematics three units are prescribed, while two are elective.

In foreign language the school must offer eighteen units of work, of which four units in not more than two languages shall be required and fourteen units shall be elective.

The school must offer five years' continuous study of Latin, four years continuous study of Greek, four years' continuous study of German, four years' continuous study of French, and one year of Spanish.

In science the school must offer six units of work, of which one unit in physics shall be taken by all students, not earlier than the third year. Two units of work in science must be offered before the third year, and three units of work after the third year, including chemistry and biology. So it will be seen one unit (in physics) is prescribed, while five units are elective.

In history and economics the school must offer five units of work, of which one unit must be taken during the first four years, and an additional unit during the last two years. So in history two units are prescribed, while three are elective.

In psychology and ethics the school must offer one unit, and in drawing one unit. Now, it will seem that the total number of units which the school must offer is forty-two, and the total number of prescribed units is fourteen, or one-third of the whole number offered, and, according to the present assignments of work, a student would complete twenty-two units of work in his six-year course, or a trifle more than half those offered by the school.

The work set forth enables the student completing the six years' work to enter any professional school, such as law, medicine, dentistry, engineering, theology, etc., and also to enter upon pure university work at once, and without delay while he completes something he began in the lower school. There are in reality only three stages in a complete education: one ought to end about the twelfth year; two ought to end about the eighteenth year; and three ought to end about the twenty-fourth year. Each of these is in a sense complete in itself, but our present scheme includes part of two in one, and so does violence to the unity of the scheme.

This question is not something "dug up" to be settled, but something "grown up" demanding settlement. Forty years ago there was scarcely one high school in the country whose work could compare with that of the second- or third-rate high school of today. "Go forward" has been the watchword acted upon, if not announced, and the end is not yet. All over this state you may find, if you investigate, that within the past five years high schools offering two years' work have increased that work to three; those offering four years' work have increased the work to five or six years. These movements have gone on, are going on, without any blare of trumpet or any precursor to make any announcement.

The demands of the people that our educational schemes be systematized and made to do service are bringing about these changes. We have tarried far too long in the wilderness, and, with the manna in our hands and the promised land before us, we still long for the fleshpots of Egypt. But "go forward" must be our watchword; Caanan is ahead of us.

In all our educational meetings—county, state, and national—we have talked long and learnedly of the boy and girl during the period of adolescence, but no one has felt satisfied that much of practical utility has been accomplished. The pupil is graduated from his eighth-grade work in the midst of this period, when he is possessed of the greatest number of hallucinations, vagaries, etc. He thinks he knows something, has completed something, and during the long vacation following often decides that his education is sufficient and that he need not go further. Now, if he is transferred from the elementary school one or two years sooner, he has time to learn his new surroundings. By the time he reaches this period he has no chance to consider his education ended; he is more easily managed, and is more likely to remain till he has completed the second stage of his educational career. So we say that the scheme herein provided will do more than has yet been done to tide the pupil over this period of adolescence. He avoids the chasm—the impassable gulf so often mentioned as separating grammar school from high school, when both ought to be harmonious parts of one unit and not two separate units.

The period of the pupil's life covered by this six-year course is the most important in his whole life, because during these years he decides what his career in life shall be; and so he needs the close magisterial and parental supervision which this proposition provides, in keeping the young men and the young women at home two years longer. The stimulus afforded by this scheme to the second and third stages of education is almost incalculable. Those who for financial reasons could not go from their own town will embrace with gladness the opportunity to fulfil their long-cherished desire for a more extended education.

Now, touching the first point in the general proposition, this scheme, representing the second stage in education, will connect with the six years' work representing the first stage, smoothly, harmoniously, and without any hiatus.

Touching the second point in the general proposition, it will be seen that the six-year scheme set forth herein includes the work of the first two years of the college.

Touching the third point in the general proposition, it will be seen that the seven years' work has been reduced to six years. The fourth point is almost entirely a question of administration, and can be arranged for by permitting the brighter students either to carry one more study during the last three years of the course, or to do more intensive work than that regularly required. To those accustomed to work according to a prescribed curriculum it may be said that a dozen or more curricula may be readily constructed from the scheme here presented.

We mention below the work which the school must offer—that prescribed for all students, and that elective:

The school must offer in

English	-	-	-	-	6	units — 4 prescribed, 2 elective
Mathematics	-	-	-	-	5	" 3 " 2 "
Foreign language	-	-	-	-	18	" 4 " 14 "
Science	-	-	-	-	6	" 1 " 5 "²
History and economics	-	-	-	-	5	" 2 " 3 "
Philosophy	-	-	-	-	1	unit, including psychology and ethics
Drawing	-	-	-	-	1	"
					—	—
Total	-	-	-	-	42	units — 14 prescribed, 26 elective

SUPERINTENDENT J. STANLEY BROWN, Joliet, *Chairman of the Committee*; PRINCIPAL H. L. BOLTWOOD, Evanston; DEAN GEORGE N. CARMAN, Lewis Institute; PROFESSOR C. B. DAVENPORT, Chicago; PRINCIPAL G. H. ROCKWOOD, Chicago, absent and concurring. A. R. ROBINSON, Chicago, absent and dissenting; PROFESSOR GEORGE H. LOCKE, Chicago, absent and dissenting.

The committee which considered the proposition from the point of view of the college reported through Professor Butler, of the University of Chicago, as follows:

Your committee appointed to report upon the general subject of the six-year high school considered from the point of view of the college has secured from the presidents of several of these institutions expressions of their opinion upon this subject. The colleges whose presidents have written to the committee are situated in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio. All these expressions are unfavorable to the plan proposed. The grounds of objection named in these letters are five:

1. The inability of the majority of the high schools to do the work proposed because of

- a) Inadequacy of the equipment,
- b) Incompetency of the instructors,
- c) Overcrowded condition with the work now in hand, and the consequent need of opportunity to perform the present tasks more thoroughly.

2. The need of the youth of the average college age for the surroundings, tests, and general atmosphere of the college as distinct from those of the high school; especially —

- a) Association with those who are maturer,
- b) Demands for new and greater effort,
- c) More effective aids to maturity and independence of thinking,
- a) Change of local surroundings and broader associations.

3 The unwillingness to adopt the plan on the part of the larger cities that have easy access to well-established colleges and universities.

¹ Physics.

² Including chemistry and biology.

4. The probable harm that would come to the American college.
5. The probable injury to our national life.

Some of the opinions expressed on these points are as follows:

1. *a), b), c).* "As to the matter of doing two years of college work in high school, I am fully of the opinion that it would be educationally a distinct loss, should this be generally adopted. There are a few high schools which are so well equipped and have such competent men as instructors that they are exceptional in this matter; and it is a more open question whether they might profitably do some of this work. As for the high schools in general, it seems to me that the plan would be an unfortunate one. The present work of these high schools is not too well done. They are already crowded in the work they have to do, and they greatly need the opportunity of performing their present tasks in a more thoroughgoing manner. To attempt advanced work would be to the injury of their present work, and would not usually result in a satisfactory training in their advanced studies."

2. "A student graduating from the present high-school course is benefited by nothing so much as by going away from the high school with its semi-juvenile atmosphere, and being placed where he is no longer at the head of a school of very young people, but is rather at the bottom of an institution of older students where he is subjected to new requirements and feels himself under obligation to put forth more or less new effort; where he can measure himself with those who are maturer than he is, at the same time when he is of an age when a degree of supervision is desirable; and where close touch with sympathetic teachers and a wholesome class spirit are of great value in shaping up his career."

3. "The plan will not be acceptable to the largest cities, if they have easy access to well-established colleges or universities. The University of Minnesota receives 33 per cent. of its students in its College of Literature, Arts, and Science from the twin cities. They pay no tuition; they board at home. Those cities could not be induced to duplicate the equipments of the University of Minnesota. The same is true of Northfield, and of all college towns of Minnesota."

4, 5. "I note the probable harm that would come to the American college, if the proposed plan were to be carried out. The college has largely trained the leaders and makers of public opinions who have given shape to our institutions and national life. These men of the past were all trained in the old traditional prescribed course. The newer education is broader, training men for the best careers, as well as for professional life, and its fruitage should be as good, or better, than that in the past. It seems to me that your proposed change is likely to deprive many men of the two best years of the college course, and greatly to limit, if not to destroy, the most excellent work of the American college, and so in short do more harm than good."

These objections seem to your committee to derive the influence they have upon those who advance them from the assumption that it is proposed to force upon, or require of, high schools in general, the six-year plan; and, further, that it is proposed to abolish the college by the absorption of its lower half by the six-year high school and of its upper half by the university. Your committee does not interpret the proposed plan in that way. The question is not: Shall the six-year high school supersede the four-year high school on the one hand, and the lower half of the college on the other? The

question is rather : Would the six-year high school meet an existing demand? If so, where and how ?

This is more than an academic question. The six-year high school actually exists. It is therefore a practical question whether such a school is a legitimate type of school, and precisely what its function is.

One consideration underlying the subject of this report is the fact that, regarded from a strictly pedagogical point of view, if not from a social point of view, the work of the first two years of the college course is essentially secondary work. This fact strongly suggests that, important as it may be, when possible, to carry on that work in the peculiar atmosphere of the college, it may, where demanded, be suitably provided as a natural extension of the high school, as now constituted. This fact seems to be recognized in the German system of secondary education.

In the judgment of your committee, a matter of more practical importance is the probability that the six-year high school, wherever it can be well organized and equipped, will first of all attract and hold for two additional years of general culture and training scores and even hundreds of boys and girls who at present end their school life with graduation from the four-year high school. These cannot, or at any rate think they cannot, go away from home to college. They can, and will, however, gladly take all that the local high school will give them. This consideration should commend the plan to every believer in college education.

Second, in addition to this higher culture and training afforded by the six-year high school, there will also be made available much technical and other special preparation for life-work now beyond the reach of hundreds, if they must leave home to secure it as soon as they have finished the present high-school course. It is happily becoming more and more difficult for the student to enter upon his professional studies without further general preparation than the four-year high school affords. The two additional years proposed would enable the boys while still at home to secure full preparation for professional study, whereas, as the case now stands, such preparation is assumed to be out of the reach of very many. The actual working of the plan in several high schools and private institutions establishes the claim of this advantage. This also commends itself to all who regard the question from the standpoint of the college.

Third, it seems probable, further, to your committee that, if the training now afforded by the first two years of the college course be made available to the constituents of the local high school, many boys and girls would be able at a moderate expense to complete half of the college course while living at home, and thus many will be stimulated and will find it practicable to afford the expense of continuing and completing their college course away from home, who could not have done this if the entire four years of college work had to be done by them in residence at one of the colleges.

It will be seen that the six-year high school is not conceived by your

committee as in competition with existing institutions. Its function is not general, but special. It aims to meet the comparatively rare and exceptional demands of a class of youth that has arisen out of the concentration of population in our cities. Such a school would not serve as a model for general high-school development, but would represent a type of school that would in all probability be rare for a long time to come. The committee would deprecate an effort to establish such a school, save in communities where the demand is unmistakable, and where it is equally evident that the school would be completely equipped and liberally maintained.

The realization of such a plan would not, in the opinion of your committee, materially effect the college in regard to its constituents or its curriculum. There will doubtless always be a large number of parents who desire for their children, and of youth who desire for themselves, the peculiar life and associations of the college. For such the college doubtless will continue to stand open when these seek entrance after the four years of high-school work. But what about the boys and girls who want and need more than the four-year high school can give, but for whom the college is now practically beyond their reach? Admitting the validity of all the objections made, it seems to your committee that, from the proposed extension of the high school, advantages would accrue to the life of the people of such character and such magnitude as to warrant such extension in the conditions above described.

PROFESSOR NATHANIEL BUTLER, The University of Chicago, *Chairman of the Committee*; DEAN CHARLES R. BARNES, The University of Chicago; SUPERINTENDENT NEWTON C. DOUGHERTY, Peoria, Illinois; PRESIDENT GEORGE E. MACLEAN, The University of Iowa; DEAN GEORGE E. VINCENT, The University of Chicago. PROFESSOR THOMAS A. CLARK, The University of Illinois, dissenting; PROFESSOR W. H. PAYNE, The University of Michigan, dissenting.

Professor Payne bases his dissent upon the following considerations:

To extend the high-school course to six years by adding the first and second years of the college course would seem to me to be an unwise public-school policy—a policy which, if largely followed, would seriously imperil our system of secondary instruction.

There is a widely popular belief that only common-school education should be supported by public taxation; that the high school is a luxury to be paid for by those who enjoy its advantages. I have no sympathy with this belief, but as it is a somewhat stubborn fact, it should be taken into account by those who are molding our public-school policy. The people will support one literary institution of collegiate grade, but they will not support fifty.

It goes without saying that the most costly element of our public-school system is our high school, and by reason of its cost, even as now organized, it is maintained with more or less difficulty. If the proposed collegiate

element were to be added to it, this cost would be considerably increased, and in some cases might become unbearable. I do not believe there is a board of education in Michigan that would incur such a risk. It is certain that there is no high school in the state that has ventured to extend its course as proposed in the majority report.

It is for these reasons that I do not feel free to approve the report adopted by the majority of my colleagues.

Very respectfully,

W. H. PAYNE.

During the discussion of these three reports, in which many delegates participated, President Rush Rhees, of the University of Rochester, contributed the following paper from the standpoint of the college:

The reports presented by the three committees, and the discussion which has already been had upon two of them, have put me under no little obligation, and have also interested me deeply. Speaking to this question from the point of view of the college, I desire, in the first place, to disavow for the colleges any element of jealousy of the six-year high school, if it is to come and is to do effectively any part of the work which now is undertaken by colleges. At Rochester we stand ready to admit to advanced standing students who are fitted for such advanced standing, whether they have secured this fitness in institutions that bear the name of college or in those that are known by some other designation. We recognize that it is our mission as well as our glory to serve the interests of the community, and we regard it as not only prudent, but also obligatory upon us, to hold ourselves ready for any adjustments and modifications that educational development in our country indicates as advantageous to the preparation of young men and women for life.

In the second place, I desire, at the risk of being somewhat trite, to emphasize what I regard to be the peculiar value of the American college as an educational agency. I think its signal accomplishment has been the securing to its graduates of a certain quality of intellectual maturity and breadth of view, which has been dependent, not so much upon the modernness of its curriculum or the adequacy of its equipment, as upon the aim which it has kept before itself and the method which in the past has for the main part characterized it. That aim has been frankly liberal culture. That is the development of the man rather than his specific preparation for any profession or calling, and the method has been that of more or less intimate influence over younger minds by men eminent for their personal forcefulness quite as much as for their scientific attainments.

Thirdly, I believe we are justified in regarding this distinctive product of the American college—namely, the production of a notable degree of intellectual maturity, as distinct from technical proficiency—as a good too valu-

able to be lost in any readjustment of our educational process that may come with the coming years; and that, therefore, the colleges are justified in saying to such a proposition as that which you are considering that they must earnestly urge that any new provision for the preparation of young men and women for life shall conserve this most valuable feature of training which our colleges have been offering.

Fourthly, in voicing that insistence I am somewhat embarrassed by the fact that our colleges have not always been true to their ideal, but have been lured on by the ill-defined desire to do the work which belongs properly to the university and the professional school. I believe, however, that, much as we have drifted somewhat aimlessly in the past, we are today recognizing with ever greater clearness the meaning and dignity of that liberal culture for which the college as a college stands (I may add that the University of Rochester defines itself as a college of liberal arts); and are owning that the colleges ought to devote themselves with increasing singleness of purpose to this noble end. How they may do this, and at the same time contribute to the solution of the pressing problem of decreasing the time requisite for the preparation for life, is something which is seriously occupying their thought, but it is not germane to the present discussion.

Fifthly, I have taken so much of my time for preliminary definition because in this way I can most clearly indicate the grounds for my skepticism concerning the wisdom of the proposition which you are discussing. As I said at the outset, if the high schools by any development can help to solve our problem of waste time, and at the same time conserve those elements of strength which our colleges have contributed to American education, we stand ready to welcome eagerly the new ally. But I doubt the possibility of securing the intellectual maturity and breadth of view for which our colleges stand by handing over to even the exceptional high schools the work of the freshman and sophomore years.

I find myself in agreement with one of those whose opinion is printed in the report submitted, in believing that it makes a difference in the development of mature intellectual powers whether a given group of subjects is studied as a culmination of a secondary course or as the foundation for a college course. The feeling that these studies mark the end of one stage in education tends to disconnect them from the more advanced and significant work for which, as matter of fact, they are meant to make preparation. Because a man's reach must be more than his grasp, it is educationally an advantage to have the work of the freshman and sophomore years done in the atmosphere created by the presence of men who are doing higher work.

Sixthly, I seriously doubt whether the secondary schools, excepting those few which are avowedly fitting schools for colleges and universities, will be content even if they are able to do work equivalent to that of the freshman and sophomore years in colleges. The fact that those first two years in college are devoted to foundation work in preparation for the more advanced and more maturing work of the junior and senior years renders these studies

somewhat ill-adapted to the last two years of a six-year high-school course. From my observation of the tendencies manifest in high-school curricula, I believe that those schools will desire to take up many of the subjects which commonly are assigned to the junior and senior years of college rather than to devote themselves to the work indicated in the report presented by Dr. Brown, and my impression is interestingly confirmed by some of the remarks made from the floor this morning.

I would go a step farther and say, if the public is to maintain a six-year high school, it would naturally expect that the last two years in this school would be the culmination of the final stage of education for many students, and would demand that the subjects taught be parallel to, if less advanced than, the subjects which we have been accustomed to find in the culminating years of the college course.

If the end sought is that maturity of mind which our colleges in the past have secured, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that in the course of education some things should come early and others should follow after; and I do not think that any will believe that those studies in history and economics, psychology and philosophy, which proved to many of us the most enlarging influences which our lives had found when we drew near our college graduation, can possibly produce equivalent results if taken two years earlier. Yet that the schools will be under almost irresistible pressure to teach those subjects, rather than to insist on the continuance in mathematics and language and elementary science which the report of your committee calls for, seems to me to be indubitable, except, as I have already indicated, in the case of schools whose one and avowed purpose is preparation for a still higher education; and I agree with those who hold that that purpose must be incidental to the work of our public schools.

In conclusion, for the reasons named: that I cannot believe that the college work of the freshman and sophomore years could have equivalent maturing value if transferred to the concluding years of a high-school course; that I seriously doubt whether the public and the high-school authorities themselves would consent to do the kind of work which the college holds to be suitable to freshman and sophomore years; and that I believe that the college view of what is suitable to freshman and sophomore years is justified by the efficiency of the colleges in producing men of intellectual maturity and breadth of view; I am not favorably impressed by the proposition to extend the high-school course for two years, and to delegate to it studies taken in the colleges in the freshman and sophomore years. In reiterating this conclusion, I desire also to acknowledge again my indebtedness to the reports which have been submitted and to the discussion which has been had upon them, and to disavow afresh any institutional jealousy of the proposed expanded high school. Any device which will more effectively secure the education of our young men and women is to be welcomed, whatever readjustments it may necessitate in existing institutions.